UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM (UCOC)

MINUTES

May 4, 2016

2:00-3:30 pm

****HOH 706****

I.   UCOC April 2016 Minutes

- *Attachment: UCOC April 2016 Minutes*

➔**APPROVED**

II.   NEW BUSINESS

A. Curriculum Timeline: Return to Earlier Deadlines Needed

Kristine Moe said that the year-round, "living catalogue" is not a realistic expectation. The new curriculum and catalogue management systems are flexible and changes can be made in an instant. However, the systems it supports are not that flexible. Mid-year revisions to the *USC Catalogue* were attempted in the past few years, but then one set of students had accurate records and another did not. The student data systems are currently set by academic year, not by semester. To revise the *USC Catalogue* in spring, the *Catalogue* would have to be published by semester, not by academic year as it is currently.

Moe said that truly curriculum is a two-year process. Ideally, schools would consult with the UCOC subcommittee chair about their curriculum plans a year before submission into the curriculum management system for Department, School and University approvals. Ideally, the schools would develop their curricular plans in the first year, have the summer to reconsider a point or two, make their final edits in early September and then submit no later than early November. The back and forth of reviews would happen. If questions were not answered, and issues not settled before Thanksgiving, they would be addressed in the brief window between the return of faculty in late November and the exodus of mid-December. In that way, curriculum would be settled and students would knowingly be signing up into the approved program and course revisions of the upcoming fall. Additionally, curriculum staff would be able to communicate with both schedulers and advisors of the planned curriculum revisions and additions. Further, courses scheduled would be accurate from the time they were scheduled and Degree Progress would have Stars reports updated for the upcoming year in advance of the semester.

Moe noted that the later, final, revision due date of March 11, coupled with mid-year implementation of the curriculum and catalogue management systems, this past year created chaos on many levels. But, in general, even without the mid-year implementation of the new curriculum and catalogue management systems, later curriculum deadlines create unnecessary confusion and frustration. Centrally, the Registrar: the Curriculum Coordination Office (CCO), the Catalogue Office, Degree Progress and Registration offices, scramble to implement the desired last minute updates. The Departments too scramble to implement and to communicate the last minute additions and revisions.

The end results are that students have felt uninformed and some have walked out on programs; schools have had to accommodate students by offering courses that were not optimally filled to accommodate the students.

With that explanation, Kristine Moe proposed that the revision deadline be rolled back to no later than the beginning of February. Also, a mechanism to encourage fall submission should be implemented to avoid the dump of proposals at deadline. The Curriculum staff is dedicated to reviewing proposals, but the faculty on the UCOC subcommittees cannot be expected to review such a massive amount of proposals in a timely manner in addition to their teaching and research responsibilities.

New proposals could still arrive by April latest for inclusion in the upcoming year's catalogue, but at least the revisions would be entered and students made aware of the revisions sooner rather than later.

Judy Garner said that Moe offered a compelling argument and was in favor. UCOC Members agreed with her efforts to roll back curriculum to earlier deadlines in service of all units and most importantly students.

B. Curriculog/Acalog Implementation: Year in Review and Adjustments Moving Forward

Asked of their overall experience with Curriculog, UCOC members agreed that Curriculog has been easy to use; it's straight forward and flexible. Members liked the transparency of the forms, and in general, preferred it to the old Curriculum Management System (CMS). Brian Head said that he loves it. Robert Morley said that transparency causes an issue for a Correction of Grades form that he plans to implement on the system. Transparency is either on or off and cannot be adjusted by form currently.

Kristine Moe said that a survey is being sent to users of Curriculog in this first year. With UCOC members and user feedback, the Curriculum Coordination Office (CCO) will update proposals, insert the missing data points, update the website and all related materials, and increase the frequency of training.

C. Curricular Improvements to Address: Process, Procedure, System, Communication, Materials, etc.

Kristine Moe asked for further recommendations on improvements. She noted that *The Curriculum Handbook* needs to be updated and simplified. Are the memos from the 1980s necessary? Judy Garner agreed that the amendments were not necessary. Moe said that the Curriculum Coordination Office (CCO) would work to update the document (and the various others) this summer, along with the Curriculum website. She will reach out to UCOC Chair Tom Cummings and available UCOC members for input and feedback.

III.   OLD BUSINESS

A. Summer Program (Brian Head, Arts and History Subcommittee Chair)

April 6, Brian Head questioned: What oversight do USC schools have of Thematic Options curriculum offerings in their respective subject areas for the Summer Program courses? Further, what are the rigor and parameters for the high school courses given as part of the USC Summer Program for USC credit? Head said that music courses have been offered as Thematic Options courses to high school students in Dornsife's Summer Program. There has been no review of these music courses by

Thorton. He questioned the review of the Summer Program courses that may earn student 3 units of credit and be applied to an undergraduate USC degree.

UCOC Members acknowledged that Cinema, Marshall and Viterbi offer courses in the summer, but they do not bear college credit. Members cited articulation as a concern and questioned why Thematic Options courses, if intended for honors students, are being used for the high school Summer Program courses.

Associate Registrar Robert Morley said that he would research the history of Thematic Options courses for the next UCOC meeting.

May 4, Robert Morley had not had a chance to research. Robin Romans said that he had been in the original meetings where CORE 195 had been decided as an option to use for the Summer Program pre-college students. The decision was made and just never reviewed again.

Tom Cummings asked Brian Head what advice he would like to give to the Provost. Head requested better communication with the schools by the director of the Summer Program, a procedure for informing schools of offerings related to the schools' subject matter.

Questions arose about Bovard College, which now houses the Summer Program, and currently has submitted two new master's program proposals. In general, UCOC members questioned Bovard College's composition, mission and strategic plan. A concern raised was that the master's programs offered by Bovard, if not academic in purpose, would dilute the USC brand. UCOC members questioned what type of review is expected for proposals submitted by Bovard, if not for academic rigor. Members felt that a clearer communication of Bovard's mission to the USC community at large would be beneficial. Tom Cummings said that Bovard College should be added to the list of schools for UCOC outreach and Anthony Bailey should be invited to discuss Bovard College in the fall.

B. GE Process (Brian Head, Arts and History Subcommittee Chair)

April 6, Brian Head suggested that General Education courses be streamlined into the existing curriculum review process on Curriculog for greater workflow transparency. The current Dropbox method does not allow for trackability, reason for request, and discussion back and forth between committee(s) and department(s).

UCOC Chair Tom Cummings said that Richard Fliegel should be invited to the next UCOC meeting to discuss.

May 4, Richard Fliegel was unable to attend the meeting. Robin Romans will reach out to Fliegel to discuss.

C. Articulation Issues (Steve Bucher, Off Studies Panel Chair)

April 6, At a future meeting, Steve Bucher would like to review the consistency of OSP criteria, specifically unit value and appropriate class-standing level. What do members of the Articulation Office consider to be appropriate unit value for a course and what criteria determine if a course should be considered to be lower or upper division?

May 4, Steve Bucher deferred this topic for discussion until the fall. He would additionally like to review the "n+1" practice of assigning week plus one to determine units. Per Articulation Analyst Shelby King this system of unit assignment may not be in the greatest service of the students.

D. Advanced Standing (Kristine Moe, Curriculum Coordinator)

What are the rules for Advanced Standing? There are various instances of Advanced Standing illustrated in the Doctor of Education (EdD), the Master of Social Work (MSW), the advanced architectural degrees, etc. The Doctor of Social Work (DSW) was recently approved, without the required 60-unit minimum, because all students entering the program are required to have a Master of Social Work, or Master of Science, Social Work, which totals a good 60 units on its own. Advanced Standing is assumed for ALL students. Most recently the Occupational Therapy, PhD proposal indicated an Advanced Standing option, reducing the 60-unit requirement by approximately 20 units, or a 33% reduction. Sally Pratt questioned, what is the University Advanced Standing policy? It is not stated directly in the *Curriculum Handbook*, nor in the *2015-16 USC Catalogue*.

April 6, Chair of Science and Engineering Subcommittee, Geoff Shiflett, said that there is no one standard for Advanced Standing. It has always been left to the units. Susan Metros said that there are universities that offer competency-based credit for 20 units, but the students must pay for the units to be applicable to the university degree. Brian Head questioned how Advanced Standing is different from Transfer Units.

Tom Cummings requested a recommendation on Advanced Standing from Vice Provost for Graduate Programs, Sally Pratt.

NOTE: Statement of Advanced Standing identified post-meeting at
http://catalogue2015.usc.edu/graduate-2-2/:

Doctoral Admission with Advanced Standing
Some doctoral programs at USC admit students with Advanced Standing (entry with an appropriate completed graduate degree from an accredited institution).
A minimum of 36 units of course work beyond the first graduate degree, exclusive of 794 Doctoral Dissertation preparation, is required for the doctoral degree if students are admitted with Advanced Standing. Additional course work may be required if deemed necessary by the student's faculty. See the Transfer Credit page.

May 4, Sally Pratt's response is anticipated.

➔ **DEFERRED**

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. GE Memos – New GE Designation to be Added to Existing and New Courses

- *Attachments:*
  o *UCOC GE Memo, April 5, 2016*
  o *UCOC GE Memo, April 20, 2016*

B. 2015-16 UCOC Year End Statistics Report

- *Attachment: (to follow)*

Members present	**Members absent**	**Guests**
Steven Bucher	Diane Badame	
Thomas Cummings (Chair)	Susan Metros	
Judy Garner	Geoffrey Shiflett	
Brian Head		
Kristine Moe (Support Staff)		
Robert Morley		
Robin Romans		